

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 7, and 10. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Lee, et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/01522178). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Although Applicant believes that Claims 1-3 and 10 were in condition for allowance as previously presented, in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has made certain clarifying amendments. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites:

A method for performing a service related to at least a data entity associated with commercial value, the method involving a first and a second mobile device user who, submitted to authorization, interact with at least a service manager over secure communication channels, comprising the steps of:

the first mobile device user directing a request for a specified service to a first service manager controlling operations involving said at least a data entity in a first user private domain, the request including an explanatory message for the second mobile device user and service parameters,

the first service manager determining, in dependence of the specified service and the service parameters, first and, at least partly, second said operations,

the first service manager performing a signal exchange over a secure communications channel with a second service manager that controls said second operations in a second mobile device user private domain, the signal exchange at least comprising an identification of the at least partly determined second operation,

the first service manager sending a message to the second mobile device user at least comprising the explanatory message,

the second mobile device user, at receipt of said message, responding to the second service manager including at least a type of response and service parameters, whereupon the first and second

service managers uniquely determine the second operation, and the first and second service managers controlling coordinated said operations in the first and second mobile device user domains, the operations comprising said first and second operations if the type of response indicates approval to the second operation and otherwise predetermined actions associated with said type of response.

Applicant respectfully contends that *Lee* fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended Claim 1. *Lee* is directed to a “credit card transaction authentication system and method using a mobile terminal.” *Lee*, para [0001]. However, the system disclosed in *Lee* only includes a single purchaser using a mobile terminal. See, e.g., para [0016]. The Office Action confirms this, relying on the “credit card company 90” of *Lee* as disclosing Applicant’s claimed “second user.” Office Action, p. 3. As amended, Claim 1 recites that both the first and second users are “mobile device users.” The “credit card company card company” of *Lee* fails to disclose a “second mobile device user.” The remainder of *Lee* fails to disclose any other user in the transaction process that is a mobile device user.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that *Lee* fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended Claim 1. For at least substantially similar reasons, *Lee* fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended Claim 10. Additionally, Claims 2 and 3 depend from amended Claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-3 and 10.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee*, et al. in view of *Meuronen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,917). Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee*, et al. in view of *Linde, et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039635). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 4-9 depend from amended Claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of Claim 1. As shown above, *Lee* fails to disclose

Appl. No. 10/517,720
Amdt. Dated January 26, 2011
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2010
Attorney Docket No. P16419-US1
EUS/GJP/11-7512

each and every element of amended Claim 1. Neither *Meuronen* nor *Linde* cure these deficiencies. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4-9.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian M. Kearns, Reg#62287/

Brian M. Kearns
Registration No. 62,287

Date: January 26, 2011

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-9447
brian.kearns@ericsson.com